

### **REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated May 13, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

#### **Summary of the Office Action**

In the Office Action, claim 10, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Publication No. 2001/0013920 to *Hashimoto* (hereinafter "*Hashimoto*"), in view of United States Patent No. 5,292,368 to *Komine* (hereinafter "*Komine*"), Japanese Patent No. 11-014953 to *Iwane* (hereinafter "*Iwane*"), and Japanese Patent No. 2001-356353 to *Hachiman* (hereinafter "*Hachiman*").

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hashimoto* in view of *Komine*, *Iwane* and *Hachiman* as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Japanese Patent No. 61-055625 to *Yamamoto* (hereinafter "*Yamamoto*").

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hashimoto* in view of *Komine*, *Iwane* and *Hachiman* as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of United States Patent Publication No. 2003/0083203 to *Hashimoto* '203 (hereinafter "*Hashimoto* '203").

Claims 10 -15 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 16~25 of copending Application No. 10/825,362 in view of *Komine*, and Japanese Patent No. 2001-330840 to *Ogino* (hereinafter "*Ogino*")

#### **Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

With this response, claims 11 and 13 have been amended, and claims 10, 14 and 15 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added.

Accordingly, claims 1-9, 11 and 13 are currently pending in this application with claims 1-9 having been withdrawn in response to the Examiner's requirement for restriction.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 11 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 11 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “mounting first, second and third pluralities of syringes each having a nozzle at one end portion at first, second and third pluralities of robot arms arranged at opposing sides of first, second and third tables, respectively, at least two robot arms arranged at each opposing side of the first, second and third tables, wherein the first, second and third pluralities of robot arms convey the first, second and third pluralities of syringes to desired positions on the first, second and third tables; loading a substrate having a plurality of image display parts onto the first table; forming a first plurality of seal patterns along outer edges of a first plurality of image display parts by using the first plurality of syringes; loading the substrate having the first plurality of seal patterns onto the second table; forming a second plurality of seal patterns along outer edges of a second plurality of image display parts by using the second plurality of syringes; loading the substrate having the first and second plurality of seal patterns onto the third table; forming a third plurality of seal patterns along outer edges of a third plurality of image display parts by using the third plurality of syringes, wherein the first plurality of image display parts each have a first size, the second plurality of image display parts each have a second size different from the first size and the third plurality of image display parts each have a third size different from the first and second sizes; and independently driving the first, second and third tables along a convey path of supplying a dispensing material through the nozzles onto the substrate, wherein driving the first, second and third tables includes moving the first, second and third tables along horizontal forward/backward and left/right directions to supply the dispensing material onto predetermined locations of the substrate without moving the first, second and third pluralities of robot arms.”.

None of the cited references, analyzed singly or in combination, teaches or suggestions at least the aforementioned features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submit that claim 11 is allowable over the cited references.

Claim 13 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 13 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “mounting first and second pluralities of syringes each having a nozzle at one end portion at first and second pluralities of robot arms arranged at opposing sides of first and second tables, respectively, at least two robot arms arranged at each opposing side of the first and second tables; loading a substrate having a first plurality of image display parts and a second plurality of image display parts onto the first table, wherein the first plurality of image display parts have a first size and the second plurality of image display parts have a second size; forming a plurality of first seal patterns along outer edges of the first image display parts by using the first plurality of syringes; loading the substrate having the first plurality of seal patterns onto the second table; forming a second plurality of seal patterns along outer edges of the second plurality of image display parts by using the second plurality of syringes, wherein the first plurality of image display parts each have a first size and the second plurality of image display parts each have a second size different from the first size; and independently driving the first and second tables along a convey path of the substrate, wherein driving the first and second tables includes moving the first and second tables along horizontal forward/backward and left/right directions to form the first and second plurality of seal patterns onto predetermined locations of the substrate without moving the first and second pluralities of robot arms”. None of the cited references, analyzed singly or in combination, teaches or suggestions at least the aforementioned feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 is allowable over the cited references.

Moreover, as described above, the first, second, and third pluralities of robot arms 605A - 605L of the present invention convey the first, second, and third pluralities of syringes 603A - 603L to desired positions on the first to third table 600A-600C. Thus, even if an area of the first, second, and third pluralities of image display parts 602A~602L may change as an area of the substrate 601 increases or as the liquid crystal display panel changes, the first, second, and third pluralities of robot arms 605A~605L may easily accommodate the changes. Therefore, reconfiguration of the dispensing system may not be necessary, thereby increasing productivity and efficiency.

On pages 7~8 of the Office Action, claims 6~8 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 16~25 of copending Application No. 10/825,362 in view of *Komine* and *Ogino*.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 11 and 13 and reconsideration is requested.

Without addressing the substance of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to timely advance the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has submitted herewith a timely filed terminal disclaimer. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection based on claims 16~25 of copending Application No. 10/825,362 in view of *Komine*, and *Ogino* should be withdrawn.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911

Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: August 5, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes

Valerie P. Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant